

**HPNS Technical Team Call**  
**August 15, 2017, 1000-1100 AM PT**

- Welcome and check-in

**Navy BRAC** – Pat Brooks, Danielle Janda, ~~Derek Robinson~~, Thomas Macchiarella, Rebecca Cardoso

**Navy BRAC Consultants** – Scott Hay, Kim Henderson, ~~Kathy Higley~~, Kira Sykes, Craig Bias

**RASO** – Zach Edwards, Matt Slack

**EPA and consultants** – Karla Brasaemle, John Chesnutt, Jana Dawson, David Kappelman, Lily Lee, ~~Lyndsey Nguyen~~, Anita Singh, ~~Donna Getty~~

**DTSC** – Nina Bacey, Janet Naito

**CDPH** – Tracy Jue, ~~Sheetal Singh~~

**City (includes OCII/SFDPH and consultants)** – Amy Brownell, Bob Burns, Christina Rain

**Water Board** – ~~Tina Low~~, Tina Ures

- Data evaluation progress update and draft schedule

- Lily indicated that Green Action requested the list of participants, agendas, and notes for these calls.
- The Parcel C trench unit report is with the Navy for review.
- The report for Parcel B soil is planned for submittal to the Navy this Friday and will include trench units, fill units, and former building sites. As discussed on the last call, the plan is for submittal to the Technical Team 9/8/17 with comments due by 9/22/17.
- The general draft report schedule is as follows:

Report/Activity	Draft to Navy	Draft to Regulators	Final
<b>Parcel B Soil</b>			
<b>Initial Findings Report</b>	August 2017	September 2017	September 2017
<b>Parcel G Soil</b>			
<b>Initial Findings Report</b>	September 2017	September 2017	October 2017
<b>Parcels UC-1, UC-2, UC-3, and D-2 Soil</b>			
<b>Initial Findings Report</b>	October 2017	October 2017	November 2017
<b>Parcel C Soil</b>			
<b>Trench Unit Report</b>	July 2017	<del>August 2017</del>	<del>September 2017</del>
<b>Initial Findings Report</b>	October 2017	November 2017	December 2017
<b>Parcel E Soil</b>			
<b>Initial Findings Report</b>	December 2017	December 2017	January 2018
<b>Buildings</b>			
<b>Evaluation Methodology</b>	September 2017		

- The reports are proposed to be submitted electronically on SharePoint ([https://delivery.ch2m.com/projects/684353/TTTS/\\_layouts/15/start.aspx#/](https://delivery.ch2m.com/projects/684353/TTTS/_layouts/15/start.aspx#/)). If users have not accessed the site within 90 days, they may be locked out and will need to contact Kim to reset access and passwords.

- The Team discussed the draft schedule for soil reports, potential for allegations to add to review times, potential shifts in submittal dates, and 14-day review periods. To-date the substantially new allegations are based on building scans and should not delay the soil reports. EPA is working on independent statistical evaluations and rankings for Parcels B and C trench units in preparation for the reports. EPA indicated that they will do their best to meet the 14-day review periods; however, Navy funding was provided through September 30, 2017 and resources may be limited starting October 1<sup>st</sup>.
- **Summary of preliminary recommendations for Parcel B soil**
  - Kim indicated that the pre-draft Parcel B report for soil is still going through internal senior reviews and although draft findings and recommendations are provided on the calls, they may change based on internal and Navy reviews and comments and should be considered preliminary.
  - On the last call for Parcel B trench units, a draft summary figure was provided where 62 were recommended for no further action, 5 were recommended for reanalysis of archived samples, and 3 were recommended for confirmation sampling. Based on discussion and Navy reviews the recommendations are being updated to focus only on the potential for falsification rather than data quality issues (e.g., negative values). There are at least 2 trench units recommended for sampling based on evidence of potential data falsification, 130 and 132.
  - There were 5 former building sites with 17 survey units evaluated in Parcel B. Three buildings and 9 survey units were recommended for no further action. Two buildings (103 and 157) and 8 survey units were recommended for confirmation sampling.
  - For fill units, there is 1 overburden unit (138) at trench unit 33 where potential falsification was identified and approximately 16 based on samples not being collected at the locations with the highest gamma readings, where confirmation sampling may be recommended.
  - Once the evaluation forms are reviewed and approved by the Navy, they will be provided to EPA.
- **Radionuclides for analysis (UFP-SAP comments)** – The Team discussed the EPA recommendation to conduct alpha spectroscopy. Dave indicated that this is consistent with most radiological sites that have NORM and would be helpful for the Navy to show areas in secular equilibrium with radium versus elevated readings of radium identified using gamma spectroscopy. Zach indicated that based on the MDAs and error bars produced using alpha spectroscopy, the Navy has previously received comments that they are not comparable to the gamma spectroscopy results and were previously not accepted. Kira indicated that alpha spectroscopy was not included because americium, thorium, uranium, and plutonium are not radionuclides of concern at the survey units identified for confirmation sampling to-date and gamma spectroscopy for NORM evaluations has been used at HPNS and at other sites. **Action Pat – Provide EPA with current reports generated on NORM at HPNS (Building 518 and Parcel C abstract).**
- **Outline for Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting on 9/11** – The presentation will include a summary of the methods and procedures used for the data evaluation. Findings, other than

potential examples of statistical results, will not be presented until they have been reviewed and approved by the Navy and regulatory agencies. A subsequent meeting will need to be held to present the final results when available.

- **Preliminary building scan findings** – Battelle is developing the data evaluation approach and methodology. A preliminary test was conducted to identify the potential for repeated numbers at the Parcel B buildings using the database provided by TtEC. Of the 6 buildings (103, 113, 113A, 130, 140, 146), there were 7 instances of shared data at 2 buildings (113 and 130). Pat requested direct downloads from the instruments from TtEC to compare with these results, the database provided, and the final reports. There have also been some examples found where based on initial statistical tests, the logger appears to have remained stationary, including at Building 146 in Class II survey units where upper walls/ceilings were over 20' high. Methodology is being developed to evaluate scan speed, further evaluate scanner movement, and the potential for removing high and low values.
- **Schedule and topics for future calls**
  - Next calls: Tuesday 9/5 and 9/19, 1000-1100 AM PT
  - Potential meeting to review approach for building surfaces: Tuesday 9/12, Action Lily - Look into the availability for EPA's large conference room on 9/12.
  - Potential future topics:
    - i. Parcel G data evaluation results
    - ii. Listing of NRC allegations
    - iii. Sampling efficiencies